

TWO PROBLEMS IN NEW INDO-ARYAN

By HANS HENDRIKSEN

THE following two problems, though different in other respects, have this in common—that they at first glance invite an easy, though phonologically unsatisfactory, explanation, whereas their solution is to be sought in other directions. My attention was called to them through my studies of some Himāchalī¹ dialects.

1. On the pronoun 'this'

When I first heard in the Himāchalī dialect of Kotgarh the pronoun *jō* 'this' I was reminded of the corresponding form in other Himāchalī dialects, e.g. in the dialect spoken to the east of Kotgarhī, that of Rohru, where 'this' is *eo*, and so I was first led to suppose that *jō* had developed from *eo* through *eo* > *jo*, though this phonological change would be unparalleled in the dialect. This hypothesis would, however, possess one advantage: the late development of the *j* would account for the fact that there is not the usual change of *j* to *(d)z* as in e.g. the relative pronoun *(d)zun*, *(d)zeo*, in *az* 'to-day', etc. The *j* only occurs in the direct case singular and plural: *jō* m.f. dir. sg. and *je* m.f. dir. pl.; the oblique sg. of the masculine, e.g., is *e* (in Rohruī *es*). Even if an exceptional change of *eo* to *jo* (> *jō*) might be explained by the emphatic nature of the pronoun, I still believe the *j*- to have a different origin. The Himāchalī dialect of Jaunsāri has *ejo* m. sg., *ejī* f. sg., *eje* m.f. pl. 'this' (m. obl. sg. *es*) (*LSI*, ix, 4, p. 391) and in Sindhi we find *ijho* m. sg., *ijhā* f. sg., *ijhe* m.f. pl. 'this' (F. Trumpp, *Grammar of the Sindhi language*, 198). What makes it highly probable that there is a genetic connexion between the Jaunsāri, Sindhi, and Kotgarhī pronouns with *j* is not only the similarity of Si. *ijho* and Jauns. *ejo* on the one hand and the close relationship of Jaunsāri and Kotgarhī on the other, but also the fact that *j* is only found in the direct case in the three languages. The same condition obtains in the Kashmir dialect of Kishtavāri, where in the pronoun 'this' *z* (< *j*) only occurs in the direct case: dir. sg. *i*, *yī*, *zī* 'this', dir. pl. *im*, *yim*, *zī*² (but dat. sg. *is*, *yis*, dat. pl. *iman*, *yiman*), see *LSI*, viii, 2, p. 362. I believe these *j*-forms go back to OIA *ayam* m. nom. sg., *iyam* f. nom. sg. 'this'. It is well known that in Pālī *ayam* is used for both masculine and feminine; and that, conversely, in the eastern dialects used in Aśoka's inscriptions *iyam* has been generalized. This *iyam* in the form **iyyam* would lead to NIA **ijj*, **ij̄*, or **ij̄*. Lengthening of *y* is a common feature in Middle Indo-Aryan, especially after *ī* and *e*; for lengthening after *i* one may compare Pālī *hiyyo*, Pkt. *hijjo*, Himāchalī *hiz* 'yesterday' from OIA *h(i)yas*. In **iyyam*, **ayyam* (for this latter see below) the lengthening may be due to the

¹ I propose calling the southern branch (including Kulūi in the north and Sirmaurī and Jaunsāri in the south) of West Pahārī by this term.

² Kisht. *zī* is valuable in showing that the *j/(d)z* element in Jauns. *ejo*, etc. is not the relative pronoun, as Kisht. *z* is not the reflex of OIA *y*.

emphatic character of the pronoun. I believe Si. *ijho* and Jauns. *ejo* to rest on a MIA **iyyam*.¹ The *h* in the Sindhī word is probably of the same nature as that in Si. *ihō* m. sg. 'this' beside *io*, *ihā* f. sg. beside *iā*, and its origin is no doubt to be sought in the emphatic *h* which also appears in e.g. Hi. *yah* 'this', *vah* 'that', in Si. *sabhu* 'all', etc. The forms mentioned may shed light on a curious word mentioned by Pischel in his *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, § 429, from *Deśināmamālā*: *ajjho* m., *ajjhā* f. 'mit dem auf eine anwesende Person hingewiesen wird'. This appears to be an early New Indo-Aryan word closely related to Si. *ijho*, but which must rest on **ayyam*. Pischel's derivation from the gen. *asya* (through **ahya*) seems to be sheer desperation! The fact that Kotg. *jō* has lost its first syllable does not seem difficult to explain. In Himāchalī an initial vowel is regularly lost if unstressed, and this would happen in this pronoun in those cases where the second syllable came to be stressed due to sentence rhythm. The monosyllabic character of the parallel pronoun *so* 'that' may also have played a part, e.g. in utterances like *jō ā so* 'this and that'. It is more difficult to explain the *j* instead of the expected *(d)z*. It may be due to a change of **idzo* through **idzo* and **dziō* to *jō*, cf. the normal epenthesis of *u*-in Himāchalī, e.g. *dzyarnō* 'to destroy' < **ujjāt*.

Similar forms of the pronoun 'this' beginning with *j*- or sounds developed from *j* are found in Braj: *jao* (beside *yao*, etc., see Dharendra Varma, *La langue braj*, 80); as mentioned above, in Kishtavārī *zi*; and in Shina *žo* (T. Grahame Bailey, *Grammar of the Shina (Sīnā) language*, 243); all of which I believe to have the same origin (**iyyam* or **ayyam*) as Kotg. *jō*. Only, it must be mentioned, in Braj and Shina the *j* and *ž* have been extended to the oblique case: Braj obl. sg. *jā*, obl. pl. *jīn*; Shina obl. sg. *žē*.²

Beside *ejo* Jaunsārī has *eu* m.f. dir. and corresponding to this we find *eo* (or *eu*) in other Himāchalī dialects. The dialects east of Kotgarh have *eo* m. dir. sg., *e* f. dir. sg. beside *e(d)zo* m., *e(d)ze* f. This duality, Jauns. *eu*: *ejo*, Rohruī *eo*: *ezo* reminds one of Si. *io* 'this' beside *ijho*. I would suggest that Middle Indo-Aryan had two forms of the pronoun, *iyaṃ*, *ayaṃ* from which the NIA forms without *j* (*z*, etc.) would come, and an emphatic form **iyyam*, **ayyam* leading to the forms with *j* (*z*, etc.).³ In Himāchalī the *-jō*, *-zo* in *ejo*, *ezo* has been felt as a convenient means to approximate the inflection of the pronouns to that of the nouns and has therefore been used not only in the oblique case of *ezo* (*eze* obl. sg. pl.), but has also been added to the other pronominal stems: Rohruī *sezo*, obl. *seze* 'that' (cf. Jauns. *sojo*, only used in the direct case beside *so*) at the side of *seo* (in its turn influenced by *eo*, instead of **so*, cf. Jauns. Hi. *so*, Kotg. *so*); the relative *(d)zezo* beside *(d)zeo*, *(d)zun*; and the interrogative

¹ The common nominal ending *-o* has been added as in Nepālī *yo* 'this' (see Turner, ND, s.v.).

² The loss of the initial vowel in **ijao* or **ajao* may be due to influence from parallel forms, e.g. Braj *jao* after *yao*.

³ Or the forms without *j/(d)z* may come from OIA *eṣa*, Ap. *eho* (see Turner, ND, s. *yo*), which would account for the *e*- in *eu*, *eo* and, through influence from these words, in *ezo*. On the other hand, there are numerous Himāchalī words with *e* from OIA *i*.

pronoun *kezo* beside *kun*. In Sindhī also a similar extension is found: *ujho* 'that', formed after *ijho*. In Kotgarhī I sometimes heard *ezo* 'this' which must be regarded as a loanword from the dialects on its east; as we have seen, Kotg. *jō* is the form corresponding to *ezo*.

If the above assumptions are correct the consequence would be that the New Indo-Aryan pronoun *i-*, *e-* should, at least in part, be derived from the Old Indo-Aryan *ayam* instead of from OIA *eṣa* as generally assumed. It is well known that some Dardic forms clearly point towards a derivation from *ayam*: Kashm. *yih* 'this', dat. sg. *yimis*, and Khowar (*ha*)*ya* 'this', obl. sg. (*ha*)*mo*, where *yimis* and (*ha*)*mo* must come from the oblique stem *ima-* of *ayam* (Georg Morgenstierne, 'Features of Khowar morphology', *NTS*, xiv, 1947, 18).

2. On the NIA word for 'was'

Kotg. *tō* 'was' would at the first glance seem to be historically identical with Rohruī *tho*, developed from this by loss of aspiration. Even if this sound-change is quite exceptional, it might be explained by the fact that the verb-form 'was' generally is unstressed. There are, however, facts which make it probable that *tō* has an origin different from that of *tho*.

The New Indo-Aryan languages possess, like Old and Middle Indo-Aryan, two verbs, one with the meaning 'to be' and another with a wider meaning, 'to become, to be'; and in most of the NIA languages—as is the case with the earlier phases of Indo-Aryan—the verb 'to be' is defective, often only occurring in the present and past indicative, e.g. Hi. *hai* 'is', *thā* 'was'. The missing forms are supplied by the other verb. Especially in the past tense the two meanings 'to be' and 'to become' have to be kept apart.

The past of the verb 'to be' is expressed in different ways in New Indo-Aryan. The OIA *āsīt* was not continued into the modern languages, except in isolated cases; instead different participles were used in accordance with the NIA way of expressing the past by means of the past participle (some Dardic languages form exceptions). We may mention:

1. Lahndā *asā*, Shīṇa *āsū* < *ass-*, a participle probably formed from *as-* in ways which are obscure to me.

2. Hi. *thā*, Pj. *thī*, Nep. *thiyo*, etc., from OIA *sthita-* (see Turner, ND, s.v. *thiyo*).

3. Braj (north-western dialect) *ho* (f. *hī*) (see Dharendra Varma, *La langue braj*, 116), probably formed as a counterpart to the present *hae* after the pattern of *calae*: *calo*, etc.

4. Old Braj *huto* (Varma, op. cit., 117).

5. Mar. *hotā*, Guj. *na-hoto* 'was not'.

6. Guj., Bundelī, Braj (southern dialect) *hato*, Avadhī *hatā* (Dakkhinī Hindustānī *athā*, *hathā* [*LSI*, ix, 1, pp. 550 ff.] are probably contaminations of *hatā* and *thā*).

7. Chinab-Sirāji (spoken north of the Chinab) *buto* (T. Grahame Bailey, *The languages of the northern Himalayas*, 37).

8. Koṭg. *to*; the Marvāri dialect Sirohi *to*; Chinab-Sirāji *to*, used as an auxiliary; the same is the case with Avadhī *tā* from *hatā* (Baburam Saksena, *Evolution of Awadhi*, 1939, 235 'the *ha-* of these forms [i.e. *hatā*, etc.] is elided after participles').

On the other hand, 'became' is expressed by forms coming from OIA *bhū-*: Hi. *huā*, Himāchalī *huo*, Braj *bhayo*, Avadhī *bhavā*, Chinab-Sirāji *bhuo*.

What is the origin of the *t* in the forms mentioned under 4 to 8 above? It seems evident that *to*, *tā* must come from one or the other of the preceding forms by loss of the first syllable. Some of the disyllabic forms are outwardly identical with the present participle of the verb 'to become, to be': Marāṭhī has *hotā* and Gujarātī *hoto* as pres. part., and hence Bloch could maintain (*La formation de la langue marathe*, § 246) that Mar. *hotā* 'was' is actually the pres. part. of *honē*, but he does not explain how this could come about. The only explanation I can think of is that it may be due to influence from the neighbouring Gujarātī which can use the pres. part. to indicate the habitual past: *te karto*: 'he used to do'. But for Gujarātī to exercise an influence on the more distant languages Braj, Bundelī, Avadhī, Himāchalī is improbable, quite apart from the fact that Himāchalī should have (*n*)*d* from OIA *-nt-*. Besides, regarding the forms in question as present participles is an unsatisfactory explanation even in the case of Gujarātī; it would be better if they could be shown to be past participles. One might try to explain them as analogical formations, but the only case which could form a leading pattern as far as I know is Hi. *sonā*: *sūtnā* 'to sleep' (*sūtnā* derived from the past participle *sūtā* < OIA *supta-*) besides later consonantal extensions in the past participle which are not rare in Sindhī and, to a lesser extent, in Gujarātī, but unknown or at least quite exceptional in the languages farther east. I believe the clue to the forms considered to be the *buto* of the remote Dardo-Pahārī language Chinab-Sirāji. The origin of *buto* is quite clear. It comes from OIA *vr̥tta-* 'lived, existed, occurred, happened'; for *v-* > *b-* in this language, cf. *batsuro* 'calf' (Sk. *vatsa-*), *baḍḍo* 'great' (Sk. lex. *vaḍra-*, see Turner, ND, s.v. *baṛo*); the change of OIA *r̥* to *u* after a labial and the preservation of the dental pronunciation after *r̥* is also what should be expected in these parts, as has been shown by Sir Ralph's studies. That this word in the forms **būto*, **būtā* or, in the west, **vūto/ā*, **vūtā* (in Marāṭhī) was once wider spread, is made probable by the fact that the OIA verb *vart-* is found in the meaning 'to be' in the Eastern Hindī-Bihārī area: Avadhī *bāṭai* (Saksena, op. cit., 234), Bhojpūrī *bāre*, and in other, but allied, meanings in Marāṭhī *vāṭṇē* 'to appear', Sindhī *vataṇnu* 'to wander', Bhadravāhī (West Pahārī) *baṭnu* 'to be able', and Sinhalese *vaṭṭinu* 'to be worth' (see Turner, ND, s.v. *bāṭnu*). If we can assume such a past participle **buto*, **vuto*, etc., its transformation to *hato/ā*, *hoto/ā*, *huto/ā* seems easily explicable through the influence of the other forms of the verbs 'to be'

and 'to become, to be'. We have here the three stems *ha-*, *ho-*, *hu-* (e.g. Hi. *hai*, *honā*, *huā*) and these stems would seem to have replaced the *bu-* or *vu-* of **buto*, **vuto*, etc.¹ It may have contributed to the change that the first syllable of the word was already obscured to the mind because it was liable to be lost when the word was used as an auxiliary, as is shown by Chinab-Sirājī and Avadhī. In some cases, e.g. Kotg. *to* and Sirohī *to*, only the last syllable remained, possibly due to the influence of *tho*, etc., of neighbouring dialects.

¹ A similar contamination is, as shown by Turner (*BSOAS*, VIII, 2-3, 1936, 801 foll.), found in Niya *hačh'ati* beside *ačh'ati* 'is' and AMg. *hokkhaī*, Bhojpurī *hokh-* 'to be, become' from *ho-* and a verb coming from OIA *ākṣeti* 'to stay'.